

IN THE SPECIFICATIONS:

Please add the following sentence to the first line of the Specification:

B¹ This is a 371 of International Application No. PCT/GB98/02317, filed July 31, 1998, which claims priority from International Application No. PCT/PCT/GB97/16224, filed July 31, 1997.

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please cancel claims 54-56, 58, 61-62 and 71.

Please amend claims 53, 57, 65 and 68 as follows:

B² Sub C¹ 53. A method of inhibiting mutagenesis in an organism, which method comprises administering to the organism, an effective anti-mutagenic amount of an extract from Aristolochia taliscana, said extract having been prepared by a process which includes extracting plant material from Aristolochia taliscana with an organic solvent, such that the extract is substantially free of aristolochic acids.

B³ Sub C² 57. A method of inhibiting fungal growth in a substrate, which method comprises administering to the substrate an effective anti-fungal amount of an extract from Aristolochia taliscana, said extract having been prepared by a process which includes extracting plant material from Aristolochia taliscana with an organic solvent, such that the extract is substantially free of aristolochic acids.

B⁴ Sub 3 65. A composition comprising an extract from Aristolochia taliscana, wherein the extract has been prepared by extraction of plant material from the Aristolochia species with an organic solvent and contains at least 10% by weight of a eupomatenoid, wherein the extract is substantially free of aristolochic acids.

B⁵ Sub 4 68. A pharmaceutical composition comprising a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier and an extract from Aristolochia taliscana wherein the extract has been prepared by extraction of plant material from the Aristolochia species with an organic solvent, wherein the extract contains at least 25% by weight of a phenolic eupomatenoid compound, at least 8% of Licarin-A and at least 8% by weight of a non-phenolic eupomatenoid compound, and wherein the extract is substantially free of aristolochic acids.

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated January 4, 2001. A continued prosecution application was filed on July 3, 2001. The Examiner has rejected claims 53-64 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, stating that the specification "does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of inhibiting mutagenesis, inhibiting fungal growth or inhibiting